

## **REPORT OF SITE FINDINGS**

---

*Ottawa University  
October 21-23, 2007*

### **Review Team Members**

*Rosemary Gaona, Chairperson, National Board Certified Teacher*

*Patty Hardy, Arizona Department of Education*

*Ruthie Davidson, National Board Certified Teacher*

*Deborah Heiberger, Ed.D., Private Institution of Higher Education*

*Jennifer Gresko, Community College*

*Amber Bickes, Community College (ill)*

*Jeff Thomas (K-12 District)*



*Arizona Department of Education  
1535 W. Jefferson  
Phoenix, AZ 85007*

## ***INTRODUCTION***

---

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for Ottawa University was conducted on October 21-23, 2007. The following programs were submitted for review:

- BA Elementary Education
- BA Secondary Certification
- BA Early Childhood
- MA Ed Educational Leadership (principal certification)
- MA Ed School Guidance Counseling
- MA Ed Special Education (Cross-categorical)
- MA Ed Elementary Education
- MA Ed Secondary Education

The review team expresses its appreciation to the faculty for their work in preparation for the visit. The faculty and staff were very cooperative with the team throughout the visit. The team further expresses appreciation for the hospitality shown them by the staff at Ottawa University.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. The on-site visits are an important part of that process. Following are the findings of the review team along with the list of exhibits and interviews used for reaching the conclusions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY

SITE VISIT OCTOBER 21 - 23, 2007

---

Report of Site Findings .....	Section A
Bachelor of Arts, Early Childhood Education .....	Section B
Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education .....	Section C
Bachelor of Arts, Secondary Education .....	Section D
Master of Arts, Early Childhood Education .....	Section E
Master of Arts, Elementary Education .....	Section F
Master of Arts, Secondary Education .....	Section G
Master of Arts, Special Education, Cross Categorical .....	Section H
Special Education, Master's Degree with Arizona Certification, Dual Certification in Elementary Education .....	Section I
Master of Arts, Education Leadership .....	Section J
Master of Arts, Guidance Counseling .....	Section K

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Bachelor of Arts Early Childhood Education

**Program Description:**

"This program (new as of summer 2006) undergraduate program is designed for the preparation and State certification of Early Childhood teachers for the State of Arizona. Candidates learn best teaching practices in professional education courses for birth to grade three. Students are required to observe and participate in early childhood classrooms with certified teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service fieldwork and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. The Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Standards are the basis for all of the professional education course work in the Early Childhood Education program. The candidates for the Early Childhood Education, birth to grade three certificate, are expected to follow the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, the Arizona Content Standards and the NAEYC Standards as foundations for lessons plans required for each methods course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. Ottawa University students have opportunities to experience the diversity of early childhood classrooms through participating in pre-service observations and activities." Early Childhood Education is not currently a State Board approved program at Ottawa University.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

**Findings of the Team:**

More than one listing of program courses was provided to the review team. During an interview session, one faculty member indicated that courses were completed by students "as the student or the course was available."

No omnibus numbers were identified; however, course descriptions for ECE3050 Early Childhood – Math and ECE 3060 Early Childhood Methods – Science were the same.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit a course sequence that reflects a clear scope and sequence of required courses.

## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

Program syllabi were not readily available. A student teaching syllabus has not been developed.

Different courses descriptions are offered for the same course. Example: ECE 30050 Early Childhood – Math: course description in the catalogue is different from the course description on the syllabus. Example: ECE 30070 Early Childhood Assessment and Monitoring: course description in catalogue is different from course description on syllabus.

The physical format (template) of syllabi in the program varies from instructor to instructor. A standardized template does not appear to exist. According to administration, adjunct instructors modify courses as they choose.

Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Association for the Education of Young Children Standards are included on the program matrix, but are not consistently aligned to course objectives.

Arizona Professional Teaching Standards are presented on syllabi in lieu of course objectives.

Course credit hours are not indicated on the course syllabi or course sequence.

There does not appear to be an established course sequence within the program.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Standardize syllabi to provide consistency throughout the program.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit course sequence including credit hours for each course.

Review course descriptions for accuracy.

Align course description, objectives and competencies with state and national standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

The benchmark/signature assignments are not defined on the syllabi or on the Program Matrix. Each adjunct faculty member determined for themselves what the course assignments would be. Students decided which of their assignments they would post to their electronic portfolios.

There was no evidence on the Program Matrix of signature assignments specific to coursework with the exception of generic indications of "lesson plans", for example. The Program Matrix identified two or three courses as places where standards were assessed, but the artifacts identified on the Matrix appear to be derived from the student teaching experience.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit



If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and implement signature assignments to access candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

Identify signature assignments on the Program Matrix.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The team found various rubrics referenced in the syllabi but there was no standardized rubric utilized throughout the program that would assess candidate competency in meeting the referenced state and national standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop rubrics that assess candidate competency in meeting state and national standards and identified coursework competencies.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition (“scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience”) ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences are not clearly identified on program syllabi. Task and structure of field experiences are not clearly defined.

A chart indicated that 5-7 hours of field experience is required in certain courses.

Student completion of field experience hours is not tracked by the college. Individual adjunct instructors determine field experience tasks. There does not appear to be standardized expectations or rubrics for field experiences.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Track completion of field experience hours prior to the capstone experience.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark (signature) assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences were not clearly identified on course syllabi.

No evidence of field experience evaluations tied to state or national standards was identified.

#### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

#### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

An evaluation instrument needs to be developed for all field experiences throughout the Early Childhood Education Program.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Student teaching syllabi was not developed. Student Teaching Guidelines were reviewed from the web; however, some of the statements offered students were of concern, such as: "...do not teach as you have been taught during your time at Ottawa University," "...a bummer of an experience," or, "... (re: conflict) do not wait for the lid to blow off of the conflict...(same paragraph) ...enjoy your student teaching experience."

The student teaching experiences were identified on the Program Matrix as the field experiences in which students demonstrate mastery of state and national standards. The artifacts demonstrating candidate competence of state and national standards identified on the Program Matrix were: classroom management plans, lesson plans, observation reports, mid/final evaluations. There were no rubrics for these artifacts.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

Review the language offered on the student teaching website and revise questionable presentations of ideas such as those cited above to a more professional language.

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a student teaching syllabus.

Student Teaching Action Research evaluations should be developed and aligned to state and appropriate national standards.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☐ Unmet ☒

#### Findings of the Team:

Well-defined rubric style criteria have been incorporated into mid-term and final student teaching evaluation forms.

However, there are no clearly, explicitly, identified state or national standards associated with the evaluation instruments.

#### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

#### Recommendation(s):

##### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards must be developed.



## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

### Findings of the Team:

There is no clear evidence that the information appearing on the Program Matrix is specific, aligned with coursework, or linked to standardized rubrics/evaluation tools to assess candidate competency in meeting state/national standards.

Students interviewed were not able to recognize, cite, or identify the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards as being a part of, or embedded in, their coursework. Students were able to discuss the incorporation of the Arizona Academic Standards.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

### Recommendation(s):

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

### If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The Bachelor of Arts Early Childhood Education Program was implemented beginning in spring, 2006.

Data assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards were not available.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## ***RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION***

---

### ***☒ Denial or Withdrawal (new programs)***

- **Does not meet** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- Program is **incomplete**
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** assessment plan

***Ottawa University administration elected to withdraw the program. The program may be resubmitted on July 15<sup>th</sup> or January 15<sup>th</sup> submission dates identified in State Board rule.***

### **PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS**

---

Adjunct Faculty Curriculum Vita provided during the review process indicated that the early childhood training of 7 current adjuncts placed them at the level of expectation for the position, although actual work experience for the majority reviewed did not indicate early childhood employment. It is apparent that Ottawa University has actively sought qualified instructors for this program.

Students interviewed were enthusiastic about the small class-size, one-to-one advising, and flexibility for enrolling in courses.

## **COMMON THREADS THROUGH B.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY AND M.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PROGRAMS**

---

### ***Students:***

All new students set up appointments to meet with an advisor to determine an educational plan.  
All students participate in a Proseminar class prior to starting classes.  
Student works with same advisor throughout program to ensure personal and continuous customer service.  
Student advisors are full time faculty.  
Various types of program delivery are offered (hybrid and online) by the institution.  
Flexible evening and weekend classes are scheduled to accommodate students.  
Articulation agreements with the community colleges exist.  
Year round enrollment is available to students.  
Enrollment in elective classes helps create a well rounded student.  
College of Education accepts up to 80 transfer credits.  
Small class sizes.  
One to one assistance on an "as needed" basis (student , advisor instructor)

### ***Program:***

Signature assignments were not clearly identified or defined.  
All program syllabi were not readily available.  
All course descriptions were not readily available.  
Student teaching syllabi was not available.  
Syllabi formats were not standardized.  
Standardized rubrics were not used in courses.  
Syllabi do not align to INTASC standards.  
Course specific objectives are often not identified and AZPTS are used place of the objectives.  
Objectives are often not measurable.  
Embedded practicum are not clearly identified in syllabi.  
Text books references are out dated such as EDF 7103 has a 1998 publication date, EDF 7203 had a 1996 publication date, EDF 7163 has 1996 publication date.  
No internal evaluation of adjunct professors.  
Matrix artifacts referenced: projects, lesson plans, journals, student teaching. Evidence must be clearly identified.  
Syllabi does not reference credit hours for courses.

No designated course sequence.

Regular education and post bacc students in same classes.

Post baccalaureate guidelines were not provided.

No formalized plan in coursework or capstone experience for at "risk" students.

Field experiences are not tracked to ensure diversity of placement or hours completed.

Courses need to be aligned with national standards.

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** B. A. Elementary Education

**Program Description:**

The B.A. Elementary Education is an undergraduate program that is designed for the preparation and state certification of elementary education teachers for the State of Arizona. Candidates learn best teaching practices in professional education for grades K-8. Students are required to observe and participate in elementary classrooms with certified teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service field work and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. The Arizona State Teaching Standards (ASTS) are the basis for all the professional education coursework in the elementary education program. The candidates for the elementary education certificate (K-8) are expected to follow the ASTS academic standards as foundations for the lesson plans required for each methods course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. Ottawa University students have opportunities to experience the diversity of elementary classrooms through participating in pre-service observations and activities.

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

**Findings of the Team:**

According to faculty and administration, the program consists of four Foundation Courses covering Classroom Management, Tests and Measurement, Educational Psychology, History & Philosophy of Education and Structured English Immersion. Six methods courses including Structured English Immersion are included in the elementary program of study. Coursework is followed by a twelve (12) hour Student Teaching (capstone experience). Foundation courses are intended to provide students with underlying professional knowledge.

There is no course sequence for elementary education program. There is a program of study with courses listed with credit hours for a total of 31 which includes student teaching but no scope and sequence.

**Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):**

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

If students are scaffolding their knowledge as evidenced in the faculty philosophy articulated during faculty interviews, it is important that a recommended scope and sequence of courses be clearly identified by the College.



## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

All syllabi were not provided to the review team at time of site visit. Two syllabi were provided for Structured English Immersion and a third syllabi was provided by the teacher assigned to teach the SEI course. Syllabi course descriptions varied with instructors teaching the courses. There is no consistent alignment between course descriptions and course objectives; such as EDU 32634 Elementary Reading Methods which states the objectives are aligned to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the APTS were listed as the objectives. Competencies were not listed.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Syllabi needs to be standardized to provide consistency throughout the program. Course objectives need to align with the course description and aligned to national standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Signature assignments are not identified in any of the courses nor aligned to the program matrix. Faculty selects own weighed assignment in their classes. The definition that a signature assignment must be identified to evaluate the mastery of the course competencies was not understood as per administration.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Signature assignments must be identified for each course in the elementary education program to be used by all faculty members teaching each of the courses.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The team found various rubrics referenced in the syllabi but there was no standardized rubric utilized throughout the program that would assess student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Rubrics must be developed that will assess student competencies in meeting state and national standards.

### **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences in the methods coursework were limited and not required in all methods courses. There were no identified signature assignments that measured student competencies in meeting the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Align field experience evidence on the program matrix with identified signature assignments in syllabi.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evaluation instrument found in program syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

An evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards needs to be developed for all field experiences throughout the elementary education program.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

There was no student teaching course syllabus for the elementary education program. There was an online student teaching process outline that tells student teachers what to do. The student teaching outline included personal comments regarding the student teaching experience; such as, "Let your advisor know if there is a problem before the lid explodes because it can be a great experience or a bummer of an experience", instructor's delivery of program coursework such as "Don't teach like the instructors at Ottawa because you don't want to teach like them." There is also a 12 Week Timeline for Student Teaching which details what they should be doing each of the twelve weeks.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching syllabus needs to be developed that aligns with the timeline to guide student teachers through their student teaching experience. Online student teaching process outline needs to match the developed syllabus.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation instrument aligns with some state standards, but does not align with national standards. The criteria in the student teaching evaluation instrument are teacher plans and materials, classroom interaction and management, classroom procedures, but include many teacher dispositions criteria. There is an instructional development scale that summarizes proficiency level for each area; levels 1-4.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards must be developed.



## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no data or assessment plan assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

Program approval is extended until December 31, 2008 with stipulations. All stipulations and program documentation must be submitted to ADE per institution of higher education developed timeline. Final documentation must be submitted to ADE no later than November 1, 2008.

- I. Develop a timeline for addressing recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Education no later than 30 days following State Board approval:
  - A. Program Sequence
    1. Review each program for sequence and coherence.
    2. Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.
    3. Identify prerequisite coursework, if applicable.
  - B. Course syllabi
    1. Each course must have a syllabi that includes:
      - a. Written course description that aligns with course catalog.
      - b. Performance-based, standardized and measurable objectives/competencies.
      - c. Objectives/competencies aligned with national standards by objective/competency
      - d. Signature/benchmark assignments that assess a candidate's competency in meeting the national standards.
      - e. Rubrics that assess candidate competency (rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels)in meeting national standards.
      - f. Alignment between course description, objectives/competencies, signature/benchmark assignments and rubrics.
      - g. Imbedded field experiences prior to the capstone as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
  - C. Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 Program submission.
    1. Review syllabi to ensure that field experiences are imbedded into coursework as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
    2. Review all field experiences to ensure they meet the definition of field experience in State Board rule.
    3. Clearly identify the performance required in each field experience.
    4. Design rubrics that assess student competencies in the field experience(s) prior to the capstone experience.
  - D. Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

- E. Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data.
  - 1. Identify and describe data elements.
  - 2. Identify activities.
  - 3. Establish timelines.
  - 4. Identify person(s) responsible.
- II. Develop a process (checklist) for issuance of Institutional Recommendations that verifies candidate compliance with State Board rules within 30 days of State Board approval.
  - A. Program requirements met.
  - B. SEI requirement met.
  - C. Verification of teaching experience (administrative and counseling programs).
- III. Review adjunct faculty expertise and background to ensure that faculty has qualifications and experience for courses assigned to teach.
- IV. Create a standardized curriculum development and review process.
- V. Develop a process for communicating State Board stipulations, timeline and program changes to full-time and adjunct faculty within 30 days of State Board approval.

## **COMMON THREADS THROUGH B.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY AND M.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PROGRAMS**

---

### ***Students:***

All new students set up appointments to meet with an advisor to determine an educational plan.  
All students participate in a Proseminar class prior to starting classes.  
Student works with same advisor throughout program to ensure personal and continuous customer service.  
Student advisors are full time faculty.  
Various types of program delivery are offered (hybrid and online) by the institution.  
Flexible evening and weekend classes are scheduled to accommodate students.  
Articulation agreements with the community colleges exist.  
Year round enrollment is available to students.  
Enrollment in elective classes helps create a well rounded student.  
College of Education accepts up to 80 transfer credits.  
Small class sizes.  
One to one assistance on an "as needed" basis (student , advisor instructor)

### ***Program:***

Signature assignments were not clearly identified or defined.  
All program syllabi were not readily available.  
All course descriptions were not readily available.  
Student teaching syllabi was not available.  
Syllabi formats were not standardized.  
Standardized rubrics were not used in courses.  
Syllabi do not align to INTASC standards.  
Course specific objectives are often not identified and AZPTS are used place of the objectives.  
Objectives are often not measurable.  
Embedded practicum are not clearly identified in syllabi.  
Text books references are out dated such as EDF 7103 has a 1998 publication date, EDF 7203 had a 1996 publication date, EDF 7163 has 1996 publication date.  
No internal evaluation of adjunct professors.  
Matrix artifacts referenced: projects, lesson plans, journals, student teaching. Evidence must be clearly identified.  
Syllabi does not reference credit hours for courses.

No designated course sequence.

Regular education and post bacc students in same classes.

Post baccalaureate guidelines were not provided.

No formalized plan in coursework or capstone experience for at “risk” students.

***Field experiences are not tracked to ensure diversity of placement or hours completed.***

Courses need to be aligned with national standards.

## ***PROGRAM REVIEW***

---

**Program Name:** Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education

**Program Description:**

This undergraduate program is designed for the preparation and state certification of secondary education teachers for the State of Arizona. The teaching majors are Biology, Business, History, English, and Mathematics. They have opportunities to experience and participate in assignments relating to secondary education classrooms with certified secondary education teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service field work and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. The Arizona State Teaching Standards (ASTS) are the basis for all the professional education coursework in the Master of Arts in Education/Secondary Education program. The candidates for the Secondary Education (Grades 7-12) certificate are expected to follow the ASTS academic standards as foundations for assignments required for each core course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. The program is designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity of secondary education classrooms by participating in pre-service observations. The program is divided in to two components with the first being the traditional certification program of studies. After the student is certified, the student may then continue on to complete the M.A. Education degree by completing the Masters of Arts foundation courses required of all MA Ed. candidates.

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

**Findings of the Team:**

According to faculty and administration, the program consists of four Foundation Courses covering Classroom Management, Tests and Measurement, Educational Psychology, History & Philosophy of Education and Structured English Immersion. Five methods courses including Structure English Immersion are included in the Masters of Arts in Secondary Education program of study. Coursework is followed by eight (8) hours of Student Teaching (capstone experience). Foundation courses are intended to provide students with underlying professional knowledge.

There is no course sequence for secondary education program. There is a program of study with courses listed with total credit hours which include student teaching but no scope and sequence.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

If students are scaffolding their knowledge as evidenced in the faculty philosophy articulated during faculty interviews, it is important that a recommended scope and sequence of courses be clearly identified by the College.



## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

All syllabi were not provided to the review team at the site visit. Two syllabi were provided for Structured English Immersion and a third syllabi was provided by the teacher assigned to teach the SEI course. SEI coursework approved by the State Board of Education must be utilized to teach SEI courses. Syllabi course descriptions varied with instructors teaching the courses. There is no consistent alignment between course descriptions and course objectives. The APTS were listed as the objectives. Competencies were not listed.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Syllabi need to be standardized to provide consistency throughout the program. Course objectives need to align with the course description and align to state and national standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Signature assignments are not identified in any of the courses nor aligned to the program matrix. Faculty selects own weighed assignment in their classes. The definition that a signature assignment must be identified to evaluate the mastery of the course competencies was not understood as per administration.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Signature assignments must be identified for each course in the secondary education program to be used by all faculty members teaching each of the courses.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The team found various rubrics referenced in the syllabi but there was no standardized rubric utilized throughout the program that would assess student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Rubrics must be developed that will assess student competencies in meeting state and national standards.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604      Met ☐      Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)      Met ☐      Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences      Met ☐      Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences in the methods coursework were limited and not required in all methods courses. There were no identified signature assignments that measured student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Align field experience evidence on the program matrix with identified signature assignments in syllabi.

**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evaluation instrument found in program syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop an evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned with state and national standards.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

There is no student teaching course syllabus for the secondary education program. There was an online student teaching process outline that tells student teachers what to do. The student teaching outline included personal comments regarding the student teaching experience; such as, "Let your advisor know if there is a problem before the lid explodes because it can be a great experience or a bummer of an experience", instructor's delivery of program coursework such as "Don't teach like the instructors at Ottawa because you don't want to teach like them." There is also a 12 Week Timeline for Student Teaching which details what they should be doing each of the twelve weeks.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching syllabus needs to be developed that aligns with the timeline to guide student teachers through their student teaching experience.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation instrument aligns with some state standards but does not align with national standards. The criteria in the student teaching evaluation instrument are teacher plans and materials, classroom interaction and management, classroom procedures, but include many teacher dispositions criteria. There is an instructional development scale that summarizes proficiency level for each area; levels 1-4.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards.



## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

Findings of the Team:

There were no signature assignments identified that are required in all courses to evaluate student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no data or assessment plan assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

Program approval is extended until December 31, 2008 with stipulations. All stipulations and program documentation must be submitted to ADE per institution of higher education developed timeline. Final documentation must be submitted to ADE no later than November 1, 2008.

- I. Develop a timeline for addressing recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Education no later than 30 days following State Board approval:
  - A. Program Sequence
    1. Review each program for sequence and coherence.
    2. Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.
    3. Identify prerequisite coursework, if applicable.
  - B. Course syllabi
    1. Each course must have a syllabi that includes:
      - a. Written course description that aligns with course catalog.
      - b. Performance-based, standardized and measurable objectives/competencies.
      - c. Objectives/competencies aligned with national standards by objective/competency
      - d. Signature/benchmark assignments that assess a candidate's competency in meeting the national standards.
      - e. Rubrics that assess candidate competency (rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels)in meeting national standards.
      - f. Alignment between course description, objectives/competencies, signature/benchmark assignments and rubrics.
      - g. Imbedded field experiences prior to the capstone as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
  - C. Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 Program submission.
    1. Review syllabi to ensure that field experiences are imbedded into coursework as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
    2. Review all field experiences to ensure they meet the definition of field experience in State Board rule.
    3. Clearly identify the performance required in each field experience.
    4. Design rubrics that assess student competencies in the field experience(s) prior to the capstone experience.
  - D. Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

- E. Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data.
  - 1. Identify and describe data elements.
  - 2. Identify activities.
  - 3. Establish timelines.
  - 4. Identify person(s) responsible.
- II. Develop a process (checklist) for issuance of Institutional Recommendations that verifies candidate compliance with State Board rules within 30 days of State Board approval.
  - A. Program requirements met.
  - B. SEI requirement met.
  - C. Verification of teaching experience (administrative and counseling programs).
- III. Review adjunct faculty expertise and background to ensure that faculty has qualifications and experience for courses assigned to teach.
- IV. Create a standardized curriculum development and review process.
- V. Develop a process for communicating State Board stipulations, timeline and program changes to full-time and adjunct faculty within 30 days of State Board approval.

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts Early Childhood Education

**Program Description:** Ottawa University describes this program as:

"This graduate program (new, 2006) is designed for the preparation and certification of early childhood teachers for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Early Childhood. The target group for this program is the individuals who hold an Arizona state teaching certificate at the elementary or secondary level. Candidates learn best teaching practices in professional early childhood courses. They have opportunities to observe and participate in early childhood classrooms with certified early childhood teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service fieldwork and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Standards are the basis for all of the professional education coursework in the Master of Arts in Education Early Childhood program. The candidates for the Early Childhood (preK to grade three certificate) are expected to follow the Arizona Professional Teaching and NAEYC Standards as foundations for the lesson plans required for each methods course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. In addition to the courses, specific to the Early Childhood concentration, there are Master of Arts foundation courses required of all Master of Arts Education candidates. Ottawa University students have opportunities to experience the diversity of Early Childhood classrooms through participating in pre-service observations and activities." **This program does not currently have State Board approval.**

Program/Course sequence	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Two different listings of courses (both lacking at least one element) were provided to the review team. There does not appear to be a required sequence of courses identified in the course sequence.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards.**

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.**

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit a course sequence that reflects a clear scope and sequence of required courses.

## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

The Structured English Immersion syllabus was not readily available for review. Foundation courses were housed in a different program's binder.

The student teaching description was located on the website. A syllabus for student teaching was not developed.

A review of the foundational course syllabi showed that the master's level foundation courses were more developed than the Bachelor's syllabi. Objectives were aligned with state and/or national standards in two syllabi.

Some courses did not present specific course objectives on the syllabus.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Website

If Unmet, further action required:

Review course descriptions for accuracy.

Further develop syllabi to include course-specific objectives/competencies that are aligned to state and national standards.



## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The benchmark/signature assignments are not defined on the syllabi or on the Program Matrix. Each adjunct faculty member determined for themselves what the course assignments would be. Students decided which of their assignments they would post to their electronic portfolios.

There was no evidence on the Program Matrix of signature assignments specific to coursework with the exception of generic indications of "lesson plans", for example. The Program Matrix identified two or three courses as places where standards were assessed, but the artifacts identified on the Matrix appear to be derived from the Student Teaching experiences.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and implement signature assignments that assess candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

Identify signature assignments on the Program Matrix.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics for signature assignments have not been developed. Individual instructors determine student performance standards for varying assignments of the instructor's choice.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and implement standardized rubrics that assess student competency in meeting state and national standards and identified coursework competencies.

### **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences are not clearly identified on program syllabi. Task and structure of field experiences are not clearly defined.

A chart indicating that 5-7 hours of field experience are required in certain courses was located in a Program Review binder.

Student completion of field experience hours is not tracked by the college. Individual adjunct instructors determine field experience tasks. There did not appear to be standardized expectations or rubrics for field experiences.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Track completion of field experience hours prior to the capstone experience.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark (signature) assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences.

**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Field experiences were not clearly identified on the syllabi.

No evidence of field experience evaluations tied to state and national standards were identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

An evaluation instrument needs to be developed for all field experiences throughout the MA Early Childhood Education Program.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Student teaching syllabi was not developed. Student Teaching Guidelines general were reviewed from the web; however, some of the statements offered students were of concern, such as: "...do not teach as you have been taught during your time at Ottawa University," "...a bummer of an experience," or, "... (re: conflict) do not wait for the lid to blow off of the conflict...(same paragraph) ...enjoy your student teaching experience."

Two student teaching experiences were identified on the Program Matrix as the field experiences in which candidates demonstrate competency in meeting state and national standards. The artifacts demonstrating candidate competency in meeting state and national standards identified on the Program Matrix were: classroom management plans, lesson plans, observation reports, mid/final evaluations. There were no rubrics for these artifacts.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

Review the language offered on the Student Teaching website links, and revise questionable presentations of ideas such as those cited above to a more professional language.

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit



If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a student teaching syllabus.

Student Teaching Action Research evaluations should be developed and coded to state and appropriate national standards.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

Well-defined rubric style criteria have been incorporated into mid-term and final student teaching evaluation forms.  
However, there are no clearly, explicitly, identified state or national standards associated with the evaluation instruments.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly defined criteria and aligned to state and national standards must be developed.

## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

### Findings of the Team:

There is no clear evidence that the information appearing on the Program Matrix is specific, aligned with coursework, or linked to standardized rubrics/evaluation tools to assess candidate competency in meeting state/national standards.

Students interviewed were not able to recognize, cite, or identify the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards as being a part of, or embedded in, their coursework. Students were able to discuss the incorporation of the Arizona Academic Standards.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

### Recommendation(s):

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

### If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The Master of Arts Early Childhood Education Program was implemented beginning in spring, 2006.

Data assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards were not available.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## ***RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION***

---

### **☒ *Denial or Withdrawal (new programs)***

- **Does not meet** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- Program is **incomplete**
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** assessment plan

***Ottawa University administration elected to withdraw the program. The program may be resubmitted on July 15<sup>th</sup> or January 15<sup>th</sup> submission dates identified in State Board rule.***

### **PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS**

---

Adjunct Faculty Curriculum Vita provided during the Review process indicated that the Early Childhood training of 7 current adjuncts placed them at the level of expectation for the position, although actual work experience for the majority reviewed did not indicate early childhood employment. It is apparent that Ottawa University has actively sought qualified instructors for this program.

Students interviewed were enthusiastic about the small class size, one-to-one advising, and the flexibility for enrolling in courses.

## **COMMON THREADS THROUGH B.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY AND M.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PROGRAMS**

---

### ***Students:***

All new students set up appointments to meet with an advisor to determine an educational plan.  
All students participate in a Proseminar class prior to starting classes.  
Student works with same advisor throughout program to ensure personal and continuous customer service.  
Student advisors are full time faculty.  
Various types of program delivery are offered (hybrid and online) by the institution.  
Flexible evening and weekend classes are scheduled to accommodate students.  
Articulation agreements with the community colleges exist.  
Year round enrollment is available to students.  
Enrollment in elective classes helps create a well rounded student.  
College of Education accepts up to 80 transfer credits.  
8 week terms for graduate courses.  
Small class sizes.  
One to one assistance on an "as needed" basis (student , advisor instructor)

### ***Program:***

Technology class was not available for graduate programs.  
Signature assignments were not clearly identified or defined.  
All program syllabi were not readily available.  
All course descriptions were not readily available.  
Student teaching syllabi was not available.  
Syllabi formats were not standardized.  
Standardized rubrics were not used in courses.  
Syllabi do not align to INTASC standards.  
Course specific objectives are often not identified and AZPTS are used place of the objectives.  
Objectives are often not measurable.  
Embedded practicum are not clearly identified in syllabi.  
Text books references are out dated such as EDF 7103 has a 1998 publication date, EDF 7203 had a 1996 publication date, EDF 7163 has 1996 publication date.  
No internal evaluation of adjunct professors.

Matrix artifacts referenced: projects, lesson plans, journals, student teaching. Evidence must be clearly identified.

Syllabi does not reference credit hours for courses.

No designated course sequence.

Regular education and post bacc students in same classes.

Post baccalaureate guidelines were not provided.

No formalized plan in coursework or capstone experience for at "risk" students.

Field experiences are not tracked to ensure diversity of placement or hours completed.

Courses need to be aligned with national standards.



## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts in Elementary Education

**Program Description:**

The Masters of Arts in Elementary Education is an undergraduate program that is designed for the preparation and state certification of elementary education program for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Elementary Education. The target group for this program is individuals who hold Baccalaureate degrees. Candidates learn best teaching practices in professional education for grades K-8. Students are required to observe and participate in elementary classrooms with certified teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service field work and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. The Arizona State Teaching Standards (ASTS) are the basis for all the professional education coursework in the Master of Arts in Elementary Education program. The candidates are expected to follow the ASTS academic standards as foundations for the lesson plans required for each methods course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. Ottawa University students have opportunities to experience the diversity of elementary classrooms through participating in pre-service observations and activities. **This program does not currently have State Board approval.**

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

**Findings of the Team:**

According to faculty and administration, the program consists of four Foundation Courses covering Classroom Management, Tests and Measurement, Educational Psychology, History & Philosophy of Education and Structured English Immersion. Six methods courses including Structure English Immersion are included in the Masters of Arts in Elementary Education program of study. Coursework is followed by a twelve (12) hour Student Teaching (capstone experience). Foundation courses are intended to provide students with underlying professional knowledge.

There is no course sequence for Masters of Arts Elementary Education program. There is a program of study with courses listed with credit hours for a total of 45 which includes student teaching but no scope and sequence.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

If students are scaffolding their knowledge as evidenced in the faculty philosophy articulated during faculty interviews, it is important that a recommended scope and sequence of courses be clearly identified by the College.

## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

All syllabi were not provided to the review team at time of site visit. Two syllabi were provided for Structured English Immersion and a third syllabus was provided by the teacher assigned to teach the SEI course. Syllabi course descriptions varied with instructors teaching the courses. There is no consistent alignment between course descriptions and course objectives. Competencies were not identified.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Syllabi need to be standardized to provide consistency throughout the program. Course objectives need to align with the course description and align to national standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Signature assignments are not identified in any of the courses nor aligned to the program matrix. Faculty selects own weighed assignment in their classes. The definition that a signature assignment must be identified to evaluate the mastery of the course competencies was not understood as per administration.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Signature assignments must be identified for each course in the elementary education program to be used by all faculty members teaching each of the courses.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The team found various rubrics referenced in the syllabi but there was no standardized rubric utilized throughout the program that would assess student competencies in meeting the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Rubrics must be developed that will assess student competencies in meeting state and national standards.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

The team found that field experiences in the methods coursework were limited and not required in all methods courses. There are no signature assignments identified that measured student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses. There were no rubrics by which to evaluate the coursework and field experiences.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Align field experience evidence on the program matrix with identified signature assignments in syllabi.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evaluation instrument found in program syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

An evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards needs to be developed for all field experiences throughout the elementary education program.



## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no student teaching course syllabus for the elementary education program. There was an online student teaching process outline that tells student teachers what to do. The student teaching outline included personal comments regarding the student teaching experience; such as, "Let your advisor know if there is a problem before the lid explodes because it can be a great experience or a bummer of an experience", instructor's delivery of program coursework such as "Don't teach like the instructors at Ottawa because you don't want to teach like them."

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching syllabus needs to be developed with timeline to guide student teachers through their student teaching experience. Online student teaching process outline needs to match the developed syllabus.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation instrument aligns with some state standards but does not align with national standards. The criteria in the student teaching evaluation instrument is teacher plans and materials, classroom interaction and management, classroom procedures, but include many teacher dispositions criteria. There is an instructional development scale that summarizes proficiency level for each area; levels 1-4.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604(C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards needs to be developed.

## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no data or assessment plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## ***RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION***

---

### ***☒ Denial or Withdrawal (new programs)***

- **Does not meet** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- Program is **incomplete**
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** assessment plan

***Ottawa University administration elected to withdraw the program. The program may be resubmitted on July 15<sup>th</sup> or January 15<sup>th</sup> submission dates identified in State Board rule.***

## **COMMON THREADS THROUGH B.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY AND M.A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PROGRAMS**

---

### ***Students:***

All new students set up appointments to meet with an advisor to determine an educational plan.  
All students participate in a Proseminar class prior to starting classes.  
Student works with same advisor throughout program to ensure personal and continuous customer service.  
Student advisors are full time faculty.  
Various types of program delivery are offered (hybrid and online) by the institution.  
Flexible evening and weekend classes are scheduled to accommodate students.  
Articulation agreements with the community colleges exist.  
Year round enrollment is available to students.  
Enrollment in elective classes helps create a well rounded student.  
College of Education accepts up to 80 transfer credits.  
8 week terms for graduate courses.  
Small class sizes.  
One to one assistance on an "as needed" basis (student , advisor instructor)

### ***Program:***

Technology class was not available for graduate programs.  
Signature assignments were not clearly identified or defined.  
All program syllabi were not readily available.  
All course descriptions were not readily available.  
Student teaching syllabi was not available.  
Syllabi formats were not standardized.  
Standardized rubrics were not used in courses.  
Syllabi do not align to INTASC standards.  
Course specific objectives are often not identified and AZPTS are used place of the objectives.  
Objectives are often not measurable.  
Embedded practicum are not clearly identified in syllabi.  
Text books references are out dated such as EDF 7103 has a 1998 publication date, EDF 7203 had a 1996 publication date, EDF 7163 has 1996 publication date.  
No internal evaluation of adjunct professors.

Matrix artifacts referenced: projects, lesson plans, journals, student teaching. Evidence must be clearly identified.

Syllabi does not reference credit hours for courses.

No designated course sequence.

Regular education and post bacc students in same classes.

Post baccalaureate guidelines were not provided.

No formalized plan in coursework or capstone experience for at "risk" students.

Field experiences are not tracked to ensure diversity of placement or hours completed.

Courses need to be aligned with national standards.

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts in Secondary Education

**Program Description:**

The Master of Arts in Secondary Education is designed for the preparation and state certification of secondary education teachers for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Secondary Education. The target groups for this program are individuals who hold Baccalaureate degrees in any field other than education. Candidates learn best teaching practices in professional education courses. They have opportunities to experience and participate in assignments relating to secondary education classrooms with certified secondary education teachers. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service field work and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. The Arizona State Teaching Standards (ASTS) are the basis for all the professional education coursework in the Master of Arts in Education/Secondary Education program. The candidates for the Secondary Education (Grades 7-12) certificate are expected to follow the ASTS academic standards as foundations for assignments required for each core course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. The program is designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity of secondary education classrooms by participating in pre-service observations. The program is divided in to two components with the first being the traditional certification program of studies. After the student is certified, the student may complete the M.A. Education degree by completing the Masters of Arts foundation courses required of all MA Ed. candidates. **The Masters of Arts in Secondary Education is not currently a State Board approved program at Ottawa University.**

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

**Findings of the Team:**

According to faculty and administration, the program consists of five Foundation Courses covering Classroom Management, Tests and Measurement, Educational Psychology, History & Philosophy of Education and Structured English Immersion. Five methods courses including Structure English Immersion are included in the Masters of Arts in Secondary Education program of study. Coursework is followed by eight (8) hours of Student Teaching (capstone experience). Foundation courses are intended to provide students with underlying professional knowledge.

There is no course sequence for Masters of Arts Secondary Education Program. There is a program of study with courses listed with total credit hours which include student teaching but no scope and sequence.



Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

If students are scaffolding their knowledge as evidenced in the faculty philosophy articulated during faculty interviews, it is important that a recommended scope and sequence of courses be clearly identified by the College.

## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

All syllabi were not provided to the review team at the of site visit. Two syllabi were provided for Structured English Immersion and a third syllabi was provided by the teacher assigned to teach the class. SEI coursework approved by the State Board approved program must be utilized to teach SEI courses. Syllabi course descriptions varied with instructors teaching the courses. There is no consistent alignment between course descriptions and course objectives. The APTS were listed as the objectives. The signature assignments were not performance based with corresponding rubric for evaluation. Competencies were not listed to inform students what they should know at the end of the class.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Syllabi need to be standardized to provide consistency throughout the program. Course objectives need to align with the course description and then align to the APTS and National Standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Signature assignments are not identified in any of the courses nor aligned to the program matrix. Faculty selects own weighed assignment in their classes. The definition that a signature assignment must be identified to evaluate the mastery of the course competencies was not understood as per administration.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Signature assignments must be identified for each course in the secondary education program to be used by all faculty members teaching each of the courses.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The team found various rubrics referenced in the syllabi but there was no standardized rubric utilized throughout the program that would assess student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Rubrics must be developed that will assess student competencies in meeting state and national standards.

### **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences in the methods coursework were limited and not required in all methods courses. There were no identified signature assignments that measured student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify signature assignments for field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

Align field experience evidence on the program matrix with identified signature assignments in syllabi.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evaluation instrument found in program syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop an evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned with state and national standards.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

There is no student teaching course syllabi for the secondary education program. There was an online student teaching process outline that tells student teachers what to do. The student teaching outline included personal comments regarding the student teaching experience; such as, "Let your advisor know if there is a problem before the lid explodes because it can be a great experience or a bummer of an experience", instructor's delivery of program coursework such as "Don't teach like the instructors at Ottawa because you don't want to teach like them."

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

A student teaching syllabus needs to be developed that aligns with the timeline to guide student teachers through their student teaching experience. The student teaching syllabus needs to show alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences.



## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation instrument aligns with some state standards but does not align with national standards. The criteria in the student teaching evaluation instrument are teacher plans and materials, classroom interaction and management, classroom procedures, but include many teacher dispositions criteria. There is an instructional development scale that summarizes proficiency level for each area; levels 1-4.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

#### If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a student teaching evaluation instrument with clearly identified criteria and aligned to state and national standards.

## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

### Findings of the Team:

The team found the program matrix to have courses grouped together with state and national standards and artifacts listed as projects, observations, lesson plans and observation or reflective journals. There were no signature assignment identified that are required in all courses to evaluate student competencies to meet the referenced standards and defined competencies for the courses.

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

### Recommendation(s):

### Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

### If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no data or assessment plan assessing candidate competency in meeting state and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## ***RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION***

---

### ☒ ***Denial or Withdrawal (new programs)***

- **Does not meet** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- Program is **incomplete**
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** assessment plan

***Ottawa University administration elected to withdraw the program. The program may be resubmitted on July 15<sup>th</sup> or January 15<sup>th</sup> submission dates identified in State Board rule.***

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts Special Education Cross Categorical

**Program Description:** Ottawa University describes this program as:

"This graduate program (new, 2006) is designed for the preparation and certification of Special Education Cross Categorical teachers for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Special Education Cross Categorical. The target group for this program is the individuals who hold an Arizona state teaching certificate at the elementary or secondary level. Candidates learn best teaching practices for Special Education Cross Categorical classrooms through the professional education courses. They have opportunities to observe and participate in Special Education Cross Categorical classrooms with certified Special Education Cross Categorical teachers. Fundamental to this program are the preservice fieldwork and practicum experiences which incorporate theory and practice. Arizona Professional Teacher Standards and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards are the basis for all of the professional education coursework in the Master of Arts in Special Education Cross Categorical program. The candidates for the Special Education Cross Categorical (K to grade twelve certificate) are expected to follow the Arizona Professional Teacher and CEC Standards as foundations for core courses. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with instruction, classroom management, assessment, and administration. In addition to the courses, specific to the Special Education Cross Categorical concentration, there are Master of Arts foundation courses required of all Master of Arts Education candidates. The program is designed to give opportunities to experience the diversity of Special Education Cross Categorical classrooms through participation and pre-service observations."

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

There is a listing of courses within this program; however, there does not appear to be a required sequence.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** Three years of verified teaching experience in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Website

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate a course scope and sequence in order to facilitate course planning and articulation of curriculum.

## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

The Structured English Immersion syllabus was not readily available for review. Foundation courses were housed in a different program's binder.

The Student Teaching description was located on the website. Syllabi are not developed for Student Teaching.

A review of the foundational and concentration course syllabi showed that the master's level foundation courses were being developed but still lacked uniform components such as aligned course specific objectives with state and national standards coding, structured field experiences with appropriate assessment rubrics, and signature assignments and associated rubrics.

Some courses did not present specific course objectives on the syllabus (example: EDC 8323 Survey of Special Education). A listing of state and/or national standards is not a sufficient identification of course-specific objectives.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

### Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Interviews with Director, students, instructors
- Website

If Unmet, further action required:

All syllabi must be further developed with course-specific objectives that are coded appropriately to state and national standards.

Course components including course competencies (objectives, field experiences, signature assignments and aligned rubrics, for example) must be thoroughly developed and aligned.



## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

The benchmark/signature assignments are not defined on the syllabi or Program Matrix. Each adjunct faculty member determined for themselves what the course assignments would be. Students decided which of their assignments they would post to their electronic portfolios.

There was no evidence on the Program Matrix of signature assignments specific to coursework with the exception of generic indications of "lesson plans", for example. The Program Matrix identified two or three courses as places where standards were assessed, but the artifacts identified on the Matrix appear to be derived from the Student Teaching experiences.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Website
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and implement signature assignments specific to each Arizona Professional Teacher Standard.

Identify which signature assignments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their mastery of state and national standards.

Identify signature assignments appropriately on the Program Matrix.

### **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics for signature assignments have not been developed. Individual instructors determine student performance standards for varying assignments of the instructor's choice.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Website
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and implement standardized rubrics or other valid scoring tools for each standardized signature assignment.

### **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences are not identified on program syllabi.

Records are not compiled centrally to document student completion of field experience hours.

Interviews indicated that individual adjunct instructors determine field experience assignments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Syllabi
- Website
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly identify field experience requirements on each syllabus as appropriate, including hour requirements, assignment structure, assessment instruments, and standards alignment.

Document each student's completed field experience hours prior to the capstone experience.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark (signature) assignments for coursework and field experiences, and rubrics for coursework and field experiences.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Findings of the Team:

Field experiences were not readily apparent or clearly identified on course syllabi.

No evidence of field experience evaluations tied to state or national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

#### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Website
- Interviews with Director, faculty

#### If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly identify field experience expectations and criterion for students on each appropriate syllabus.

Develop and implement standards-based rubrics for each field experience assignment.

## **STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

There are no syllabi developed for student teaching. It was not possible to identify alignment. Components were not available for analysis.

Student Teaching Guidelines were reviewed from the web; however, some of the statements offered students were of concern, such as: "...do not teach as you have been taught during your time at Ottawa University," "...a bummer of an experience," or, "... (re: conflict) do not wait for the lid to blow off of the conflict... (same paragraph) ...enjoy your student teaching experience."

The Student Teaching experiences were identified on the Program Matrix as the field experiences in which students demonstrate mastery of state and national standards. The artifacts demonstrating Standards mastery identified on the Program Matrix were: classroom management plans, lesson plans, observation reports, mid/final evaluations. There were no rubrics for these artifacts.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

### Recommendation(s):

Review the language offered on the Student Teaching website links, and revise questionable presentations of ideas such as those cited above to a more professional language.

### Evidence used for decision:

- Course syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Interviews with faculty/staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course syllabi for Student Teaching with course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences, and rubrics for coursework and field experiences must be developed and implemented.

Student Teaching Action Research evaluations should be developed and coded to appropriate state and national standards.



## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Mid-term and final student teaching evaluation forms include defined criteria.

However, there are no clearly, explicitly, identified state or national standards associated with the evaluation instruments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Evaluation instruments in Program Review binder
- Interviews with students/cooperating teachers

If Unmet, further action required:

The evaluation instruments must be aligned appropriate state and national standards.

## **PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

### Findings of the Team:

There is no clear evidence that the information appearing on the Program Matrix is aligned with coursework, or linked to standardized rubrics/evaluation tools to assess student mastery of state/national standards.

Students interviewed were not able to recognize, cite, or identify the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards as being a part of, or embedded in, their coursework. Students were able to discuss the incorporation of the Arizona Academic Standards

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

### Recommendation(s):

#### Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder
- Program Course Syllabi as available
- Interviews with students

#### If Unmet, further action required:

Develop standardized syllabi specifying coursework, objectives, assignments, rubrics/assessments, field experiences, and alignment to appropriate state and national standards.

Clearly identify artifacts on the Program Matrix so that student mastery of each state and national standard can be verified.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The Bachelor of Arts Early Childhood Education Program was implemented beginning in spring, 2006.

Data assessing candidates' competency in meeting state and national standards were not available.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Review binder

If Unmet, further action required:

An Assessment Plan for obtaining student performance data in relation to mastery of state and national standards needs to be developed and implemented. See program recommendation for additional requirements and timeline.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

Program approval is extended until December 31, 2008 with stipulations. All stipulations and program documentation must be submitted to ADE per institution of higher education developed timeline. Final documentation must be submitted to ADE no later than November 1, 2008.

- I. Develop a timeline for addressing recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Education no later than 30 days following State Board approval:
  - A. Program Sequence
    1. Review each program for sequence and coherence.
    2. Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.
    3. Identify prerequisite coursework, if applicable.
  - B. Course syllabi
    1. Each course must have a syllabi that includes:
      - a. Written course description that aligns with course catalog.
      - b. Performance-based, standardized and measurable objectives/competencies.
      - c. Objectives/competencies aligned with national standards by objective/competency
      - d. Signature/benchmark assignments that assess a candidate's competency in meeting the national standards.
      - e. Rubrics that assess candidate competency (rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels)in meeting national standards.
      - f. Alignment between course description, objectives/competencies, signature/benchmark assignments and rubrics.
      - g. Imbedded field experiences prior to the capstone as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
  - C. Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 Program submission.
    1. Review syllabi to ensure that field experiences are imbedded into coursework as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
    2. Review all field experiences to ensure they meet the definition of field experience in State Board rule.
    3. Clearly identify the performance required in each field experience.
    4. Design rubrics that assess student competencies in the field experience(s) prior to the capstone experience.
  - D. Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

- E. Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data.
  - 1. Identify and describe data elements.
  - 2. Identify activities.
  - 3. Establish timelines.
  - 4. Identify person(s) responsible.
- II. Develop a process (checklist) for issuance of Institutional Recommendations that verifies candidate compliance with State Board rules within 30 days of State Board approval.
  - A. Program requirements met.
  - B. SEI requirement met.
  - C. Verification of teaching experience (administrative and counseling programs).
- III. Review adjunct faculty expertise and background to ensure that faculty has qualifications and experience for courses assigned to teach.
- IV. Create a standardized curriculum development and review process.
- V. Develop a process for communicating State Board stipulations, timeline and program changes to full-time and adjunct faculty within 30 days of State Board approval.

### ***PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS***

---

The Special Education Cross Categorical Program needs further development to be considered standards-based.

Students interviewed were quite enthusiastic about the small class sizes, the one-to-one advising and attention, and the flexibility available for enrolling in courses.

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts, Education Leadership

**Program Description:**

This graduate program is designed for the preparation and state certification of Public School Administrators/Principals for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Education Leadership. The target groups for this program are those individuals who hold an Arizona state teaching certificate at the elementary or secondary level. Candidates learn the theory and practice of Public School Administration through the professional education courses in the program of study. Students have opportunities to experience and participate in assignments relating to Public School Administration with certified Public School Administrators. Fundamental to this program are the pre-service fieldwork and practicum experiences where theory and practice are incorporated into an experience for the candidate. The Arizona Professional Administrative Standards (APAS) and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC) are the basis for all the professional education course work in the Master of Arts in Education/Public School Administration/Principal program. The candidates for the Public School Administration/Principal certificate are expected to follow the APAS and ISLLC standards as foundations for assignments required for each core course. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with administration. In addition to the courses specific to the concentration, there are Master of Arts foundation courses required of all MA Ed candidates. The program is designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity of Public School Administration by participating in pre-service observations.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No identified credit hours, scope or sequence
Meets certification requirements	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (SEI)
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

**Findings of the Team:**

The program is a 36 credit hour program in Education Leadership (administration). Course work is divided into Foundation courses (15 credit hours) and Concentration courses (21 credit hours). Course terms run twelve weeks. Foundation courses are taught alternately between online and face-to-face. According to Dr. Braly, students are encouraged to take Concentration courses either prior to or concurrent with Foundation courses. Although the acceptance of credits from other institutions is liberal (80 credit hours), the acceptance of only recent course work in education (within the last five years) provides a quality check to ensure appropriate rigor and relevance.

Scope/sequence not clearly identified on either Checklist or Education Course Descriptions.

Credit hours for each course not identified on the Program/Course sequence.

Prerequisites not identified for specific courses.

Courses offered appear to meet requirements based upon course description.

SEI not listed on course requirements.

Skill requirements are not clearly identified as applicable for a principal certificate or a practicing building level administrator. Many competencies are for district level administration (example: EDC 7153 Education Law, EDC 7713 School and Community Relations).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Identify prerequisites for specific courses.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Review program for sequence and coherence.

Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.

Develop process for verification of SEI course work completion prior to issuance of an Institutional Recommendation (IR).

Develop process for verification of three years of applicable teaching experience Pre-kindergarten- 12<sup>th</sup> grade prior to issuance of an Institutional Recommendation (IR).

Clearly identify skill requirements for a principal certificate or a practicing building level administrator.



## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable, ISLLC Standards used
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure.

In several cases the syllabi had course descriptions that were different than course descriptions provided in other institutional documents.

Many text books cited as key reference documents for courses were either out of date or publication was not identified. This was most notable with texts that did not reflect the significant changes regarding education after the passage of No Child Left Behind.

Course policies/procedures were inconsistent regarding attendance, grading, including several instances where grades were contracted by the level/amount of work done by the student.

Courses identified as Foundation Courses did not have course descriptions provided.

Syllabi were aligned to Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.

Many objectives were not measurable or performance-based.

Topics were not in alignment with course description or standards to be measured against.

Ottawa Program competencies were not clearly connected with individual course syllabi.

Additional competencies that are course specific were not consistently identified.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create a standardized format that includes; course description, objectives, student competencies, signature assignment(s) and rubrics (example: EDC 7713, School and Community Relations).

Demonstrate consistent use of rubrics to assess signature assignments.

Identify practicum requirements in each course, consistent with the description of imbedded field experience (EDC 7713, EDC 7723, EDC 7733, EDC 7153, EDC 7743, EDC 8073) including criteria and performance assessments for the field experience.

Develop consistent policies/procedures regarding attendance and grading.

Develop learner objectives that are measurable and performance-based, especially for signature assignments.

Align topics and course description to standards to be measured against.

Identify Ottawa Program competencies connected with individual course syllabi.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Establish consistency of course descriptions for all institutional documents (Example: EDC 7733 The Principalship).

Develop course descriptions for Foundation courses.

Review all syllabi for coherence between coursework objectives/competencies, benchmark/signature assignments, student directions for completion of benchmark/signature assignments, alignment of program matrix and alignment national standards.

## **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Benchmark assignments were not clearly identified in course syllabi.

The only signature assignment referenced on the program matrix was for the capstone experience/course.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

The Final Evaluation Form is based upon the ISLLC Standards and does provide an appropriate framework for assessment. The assessment does not provide for criteria but instead relies upon judgment of the person completing the form.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

## **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No evidence of consistent use of rubrics to assess signature assignments.

No rubrics were available for assessment of signature assignments.

No evidence of standard rubric for assessment of benchmark/signature assignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Design rubrics that assess a candidate's competency in meeting national standards. These rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☐ Unmet ☒ Not consistent with definition

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Field experience requirements were not clearly identified.

Practicum requirements were not identified in each course; this was inconsistent with the description of imbedded field experience (EDC 7713, EDC 7723, EDC 7733, EDC 7153, EDC 7743, EDC 8073) with a minimum requirement of 5-7 clock hours as described in section B-6 of Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2. According to Dr. Braly imbedding the field experience is a goal for the future of the program. Currently if field experience is required faculty are responsible for setting up the experience, criteria and performance assessments for the field experience.

A general lack of a clear connection between the definition of field experience prior to the capstone experience, identified requirements, performance assessment and alignment creates a significant gap.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 program submission:

Meets the definition of field experience in State Board rule.

Clearly identifies the performance required for the field experience.

Imbedded in each course as listed in the Step 2 program submission.

Assesses student competencies in the field experience prior to the capstone experience.

Aligns with the ISLLC standards.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☐ Not applicable

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ No rubrics/instrument provided as evidence

Findings of the Team:

No evaluation instrument for imbedded field experience.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 program submission:

Meets the definition of field experience in State Board rule.

Clearly identifies the performance required for the field experience.

Is imbedded in each course as listed in the Step 2 submission.

Design a rubric that assesses student competencies in the field experience prior to the capstone experience.

Aligns with the ISLLC standards.



## **CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

General lack of alignment between course objectives, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark/signature assignments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop consistent alignment of course description, objectives, competencies and signature assignments.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☐ Not applicable

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐ Aligned to ISLLC Standards

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Levels of competence not clearly identified (NO=Not Observed, 1=Does Not Meet the Standard, 2=Meets the Standard, 3=Exceeds the Standard)

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Review the ISLLC Standards and identify skills and competencies required at the ISLLC indicator level for the principal or building level administrator upon successful completion of the program. Each course competency must be aligned with the ISLLC standards by competency.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit
- Interview with high school principal

If Unmet, further action required:

**PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Lack of sufficient data and analysis.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

Program approval is extended until December 31, 2008 with stipulations. All stipulations and program documentation must be submitted to ADE per institution of higher education developed timeline. Final documentation must be submitted to ADE no later than November 1, 2008.

- I. Develop a timeline for addressing recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Education no later than 30 days following State Board approval:
  - A. Program Sequence
    1. Review each program for sequence and coherence.
    2. Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.
    3. Identify prerequisite coursework, if applicable.
  - B. Course syllabi
    1. Each course must have a syllabi that includes:
      - a. Written course description that aligns with course catalog.
      - b. Performance-based, standardized and measurable objectives/competencies.
      - c. Objectives/competencies aligned with national standards by objective/competency
      - d. Signature/benchmark assignments that assess a candidate's competency in meeting the national standards.
      - e. Rubrics that assess candidate competency (rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels)in meeting national standards.
      - f. Alignment between course description, objectives/competencies, signature/benchmark assignments and rubrics.
      - g. Imbedded field experiences prior to the capstone as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
  - C. Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 Program submission.
    1. Review syllabi to ensure that field experiences are imbedded into coursework as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
    2. Review all field experiences to ensure they meet the definition of field experience in State Board rule.
    3. Clearly identify the performance required in each field experience.
    4. Design rubrics that assess student competencies in the field experience(s) prior to the capstone experience.
  - D. Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

- E. Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data.
  - 1. Identify and describe data elements.
  - 2. Identify activities.
  - 3. Establish timelines.
  - 4. Identify person(s) responsible.
- II. Develop a process (checklist) for issuance of Institutional Recommendations that verifies candidate compliance with State Board rules within 30 days of State Board approval.
  - A. Program requirements met.
  - B. SEI requirement met.
  - C. Verification of teaching experience (administrative and counseling programs).
- III. Review adjunct faculty expertise and background to ensure that faculty has qualifications and experience for courses assigned to teach.
- IV. Create a standardized curriculum development and review process.
- V. Develop a process for communicating State Board stipulations, timeline and program changes to full-time and adjunct faculty within 30 days of State Board approval.

## PROGRAM REVIEW

---

**Program Name:** Master of Arts, School Guidance Counseling

**Program Description:**

This graduate program is designed for the preparation and state certification of public school Guidance Counselors (SGC) for the State of Arizona and the awarding of the Master of Arts in Education degree with a concentration in School Guidance Counseling. Candidates learn the theory and practice of School Guidance Counseling through the professional education courses in the program of study. They have opportunities to experience and participate in assignments with certified public school counselors. Fundamental to this program are pre-service fieldwork and practicum experiences incorporating theory and practice. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and Comprehensive Counseling Based Guidance (CCBG) program standards are the basis for all the professional education course work in the Master of Arts in Education/School Guidance Counseling program. The candidates for the SGC certificate are expected to follow the CACREP and CCBG standards. There is emphasis on the use of technology for various tasks associated with counseling functions, assessment, and administration of counseling programs. In addition to the courses specific to the SGC concentration, there are Master of Arts foundation courses required of all MA Ed candidates. The program is designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity of public school counseling by participating in pre-service observations.

Program/Course sequence

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ No identified credit hours, scope or sequence

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

**Findings of the Team:**

The program is a 36 credit hour program in Education School Guidance Counseling. Coursework is divided into Foundation courses (15 credit hours), Concentration courses (21 credit hours) and Electives (3 credit hours). Course terms run twelve weeks. Foundation courses are taught alternately between online and face-to-face. According to Dr. Braly, students are encouraged to take Concentration courses either prior to or concurrent with Foundation courses. Although the acceptance of credits from other institutions is liberal (80 credit hours), the acceptance of only recent course work in education (within the last five years) provides a quality check to ensure appropriate rigor and relevance.

Scope/sequence not clearly identified on either Checklist or Education Course Descriptions.

Credit hours for each course not identified on the Program/Course sequence.

Prerequisites not identified for specific courses.

Courses offered appear to meet requirements based upon course description.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

**R7-2-615 (B) 2: Verified requirements:**

Recommendation(s):

Identify prerequisites for specific courses.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Review program for sequence and coherence.

Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.

Develop process for verification of three years of applicable teaching experience Pre-kindergarten- 12<sup>th</sup> grade or other identified requirements per R7-2-615 B.



## **COURSE INFORMATION**

---

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> CACREP and CCGB
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Findings of the Team:

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure.

In several cases the syllabi had course descriptions that were different than course descriptions provided in other institutional documents.

Course policies/procedures were inconsistent regarding attendance, grading, including several instances where grades were contracted by the level/amount of work done by the student.

Courses identified as Foundation Courses did not have course descriptions provided.

Aligned to Interstate CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Program) CCGB (Comprehensive Counseling Guidance Based) Standards.

Many objectives were not measurable or performance-based.

Topics were not in alignment with course description or standards to be measured against.

Ottawa Program competencies were not clearly connected with individual course syllabi.

Additional competencies that are course specific were not consistently identified.

Many text books cited as key reference documents for courses were either out of date date of publication was not identified. This was most notable with texts that did not reflect the significant changes regarding education after the passage of No Child Left Behind.

### Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Ensure course descriptions are consistent in all institutional documents. (Example EDC 7133 Counseling and the Helping Profession)..

Create a standardized format that includes; course description, objectives, student competencies signature assignment(s) and rubrics.

Identify practicum requirements in each course, consistent with the description of imbedded field experience (EDC 7433, EDC 8014, EDC 7933, EDC 8284, EDC 8263, EDF 7403) including criteria and performance assessments for the field experience.

Develop consistent policies/procedures regarding attendance and grading.

Develop learner objectives that are measurable and performance-based, especially for signature assignments.

Align course descriptions, topics and competencies.

Identify Ottawa Program competencies connected with individual course syllabi.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required

Review all syllabi for coherence between coursework objectives/competencies, benchmark/signature assignments, student directions for completion of benchmark/signature assignments, alignment on program matrix, and alignment to CACREP standards at the performance indicator level.

### **BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Benchmark assignments were not clearly identified in course syllabi.

The only signature assignment referenced on the program matrix was for the capstone experience/course.

Value of signature assignment was not reflective of the expected level of performance observed (example EDC 7133).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):** Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Review weighting of signature assignments.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

## **RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No evidence of consistent use of rubrics to assess signature assignments.

Evidence identified as rubrics were scoring guides and grade sheets but not rubrics.

Scoring guides presented did not address the student competencies to be observed but focused on writing conventions, structure and organization (example EDC 7133).

No evidence of performance criteria for assessing benchmark/signature assignments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Provide staff professional development on design of rubrics.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Design rubrics that assess a candidate's competency in meeting national standards. These rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

---

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")  
ARS R7-2-604      Met ☐      Unmet ☒ Not consistent with definition

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)      Met ☐      Unmet ☒

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences      Met ☐      Unmet ☒

### Findings of the Team:

Field experience requirements were not clearly identified.

Practicum requirements were inconsistent with the description of imbedded field experience (EDC 7433, EDC 8014, EDC 7933, EDC 8284, EDC 8263, and EDF 7403) with a minimum requirement of 5-7 clock hours as described in section B-6 of Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2.

According to Dr. Braly imbedding the field experience is a goal for the future of the program. Currently if field experience is required faculty are responsible for setting up the experience, criteria and performance assessments for the field experience.

A general lack of a clear connection between the definition of field experience prior to the capstone experience, identified requirements, performance assessment and alignment creates a significant gap.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 program submission:

Meets the definition of field experience in State Board rule.

Clearly identifies the performance required for the field experience.

Imbedded in each course as listed in the Step 2 submission.

Assesses student competencies in the field experience prior to the capstone experience.

Aligns with CACREP standards.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting CACREP standards.

### **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☐ Not applicable

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ No rubrics/instrument provided as evidence

Findings of the Team:

No evaluation instrument for imbedded field experience.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 program submission that:

Meets the definition of field experience in State Board rule.

Clearly identifies the performance required for the field experience.

Is imbedded in each course as listed in the Step 2 submission.

Assesses student competencies in the field experience prior to the capstone experience.

Aligns with CACREP standards.



## **CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE**

---

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Not aligned to CACREP Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 program submission that:

Meets the definition of field experience in State Board rule.

Clearly identifies the performance required for the field experience.

Is imbedded in each course as listed in the Step 2 submission.

Assesses student competencies in the field experience prior to the capstone experience.

Aligns with CACREP standards.

Re-submit program matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience. Signature/benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting CACREP standards.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE**

---

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☐ Not applicable

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐ Aligned to ISLLC Standards

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Final Evaluation Form for counseling capstone experience lists skills to be observed along with levels of performance.

Levels of competence are not clearly defined (NO=Not Observed, 1=Does Not Meet the Standard, 2=Meets the Standard, 3=Exceeds the Standard).

Criteria used to assess performance are high school oriented, with little to no direct application to middle or elementary level counseling.

The evaluation form does not appear to be aligned with the CACREP standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604 (C) (2):** Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly identify performance levels and define.

Align with the CACREP standards.

Broaden perspective of assessment to include middle and elementary levels of counseling experience.

**PROGRAM MATRIX**

---

The program matrix does not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work and assessment.

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Lack of sufficient data, analysis.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of course syllabi
- Review of Program Approval Report, Step 2
- Interviews with faculty, administration, adjunct faculty
- Review of additional documentation in conjunction with site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop and submit plan for collecting and analyzing data:

Provide a description of the data elements.

Identify activities.

Establish timelines.

Identify person(s) responsible.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

Program approval is extended until December 31, 2008 with stipulations. All stipulations and program documentation must be submitted to ADE per institution of higher education developed timeline. Final documentation must be submitted to ADE no later than November 1, 2008.

- I. Develop a timeline for addressing recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Education no later than 30 days following State Board approval:
  - A. Program Sequence
    1. Review each program for sequence and coherence.
    2. Clearly identify the number of credit hours for each course.
    3. Identify prerequisite coursework, if applicable.
  - B. Course syllabi
    1. Each course must have a syllabi that includes:
      - a. Written course description that aligns with course catalog.
      - b. Performance-based, standardized and measurable objectives/competencies.
      - c. Objectives/competencies aligned with national standards by objective/competency
      - d. Signature/benchmark assignments that assess a candidate's competency in meeting the national standards.
      - e. Rubrics that assess a candidate's competency (rubrics must have clearly identified performance levels, criteria and anchor statements that discriminate between the identified performance levels) in meeting national standards.
      - f. Alignment between course description, objectives/competencies, signature/benchmark assignments and rubrics.
      - g. Imbedded field experiences prior to the capstone as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
  - C. Develop a comprehensive field experience component that reflects the Step 2 Program submission.
    1. Review syllabi to ensure that field experiences are imbedded into coursework as identified in Step 2 of the program submission.
    2. Review all field experiences to ensure they meet the definition of field experience in State Board rule.
    3. Clearly identify the performance required in each field experience.
    4. Design rubrics that assess student competencies in the field experience(s) prior to the capstone experience.
  - D. Re-submit Program Matrix that identifies how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework. Signature/benchmark assignments must provide evidence of candidate competency in meeting national standards.

- E. Develop and submit a plan for collecting and analyzing data.
  - 1. Identify and describe data elements.
  - 2. Identify activities.
  - 3. Establish timelines.
  - 4. Identify person(s) responsible.
- II. Develop a process (checklist) for issuance of Institutional Recommendations that verifies candidate compliance with State Board rules within 30 days of State Board approval.
  - A. Program requirements met.
  - B. Verification of teaching experience (administrative and counseling programs).
- III. Review adjunct faculty expertise and background to ensure that faculty has qualifications and experience for courses assigned to teach.
- IV. Create a standardized curriculum development and review process.
- V. Develop a process for communicating State Board stipulations, timeline and program changes to full-time and adjunct faculty within 30 days of State Board approval.